

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on May 31, 2007, in which claims 9 and 15-18 were rejected, and claims 10-14 and 19-21 were objected to.

Claim Objections

Claim 9 was objected to for lacking antecedence in the phrase “the detectors provided in the ... vertical upright arm.” With this Amendment, claim 9 is amended to recite that the vertical upright arm has detectors, so that proper antecedent basis for this phrase is provided. This objection to claim 9 should therefore be withdrawn.

Claim 9 was also objected to because the Examiner contended that “it is not known for certain if [the calibrator and collimator] are located on the sliding deck, the radiation source, or on one of the arms.” The element in question of claim 9 reads “***said sliding deck is provided, in turn, with the radiation source***, the X-ray generated therefrom being in the face of the detectors provided in the horizontal cross arm and vertical upright arm, ***with a calibrator, and with a collimator***.” Thus, claim 9 indicates that the sliding deck is provided with a calibrator and with a collimator. It is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is clear as written with respect to the location of the calibrator and the collimator, and this objection to claim 9 should therefore be withdrawn.

Claim 12 was objected to for lacking antecedence in the phrase “the display device” and for failing to correctly recite “the remote control device.” With this Amendment, these informalities have been corrected, so that the objection to claim 12 should be withdrawn.

Claims 16 and 17 were objected to for lacking antecedence in the phrases “the output shaft” and “the rail.” With this Amendment, these informalities have been corrected, so that the objection to claims 16 and 17 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 9, 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang et al. (USP 6,920,197) in view of Eiler (USP 6,058,158) and Lowman (USP 6,763,635). Claims 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang et al. in views of Eiler and Lowman, and further in view of Franke (USP 3,565,218).

With this Amendment, independent claim 9 is amended to incorporate the language of claim 10 (and claim 10 is canceled without prejudice to avoid redundancy). Claim

10 was indicated to be allowable over the prior art of record, and therefore claim 9 as amended is now in condition for allowance. Claims 11-21 depend from amended claim 9, and for at least that reason are allowable therewith. The rejection of claims 9 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should accordingly be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims 9 and 11-21 are in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate the allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 8/20/07

By: 

Alan M. Koenck, Reg. No. 43,724
The Kinney & Lange Building
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

AMK